

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,711	08/06/2003	Jan van Buuren	F7420(V)	1913
201 UNILEVER IN	7590 07/16/200 ITELLECTUAL PROF		EXAM	INER
700 SYLVAN AVENUE,			PADEN, CAROLYN A	
BLDG C2 SOU ENGLEWOOD	UTH D CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2	021110,110010020		1761	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/635,711	VAN BUUREN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
	* .	Carolyn A. Paden	1761		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address		
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	ZIS SET TO EVDIDE 2 MONT	.P(6) OB THIBTY (30) DAV6		
WHIC - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr , cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed  rom the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ju	<u>ıne 2007</u> .			
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-4,11 and 12 is/are pending in the ap	oplication.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) 1-4, 11-12 is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement			
ات (۵	are subject to restriction and/o	Cicolon requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers		•		
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,	•		
Priority ı	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 H.S.C. & 119	1(a)-(d) or (f)		
•	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority dilder 55 0.0.0. § 115	(a)-(a) or (i).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ation No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been rece	ived in this National Stage		
	application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rece	ived.		
Attachmen	• •	<u>_</u>			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail			
3) Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date		al Patent Application		

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711

Art Unit: 1761

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decio (0,421,504) in view of Chen (5,374,751) and further in view of Lai Ganguli (0849353).

Decio discloses a margarine that is made from olive oil and butter. The spread is made from unrefined olive oil and has a characteristic olive flavour. The claims appear to differ from the reference in the recitation that the oil has a particular polyphenol content and that the oil has no perceivable olive oil odor. Chen teaches deodorizing edible oil. In the abstract, the process is indicated to remove substances that impart a disagreeable odor and taste to the oil. At example 1 the preparation of olive oil is disclosed. Lai Ganguli teaches that olive oil is known to contain polyphenols (page 2, lines 16-27). In Ganguli the polyphenols do not appear to be volatile because they are prepared by extraction into water

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711

Art Unit: 1761 .

and the concentration by evaporation of the water phase (see abstract). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the oil of Chen in the margarine of Decio in order to prepare a butter that does not have a typical olive oil bitter type flavor. Although the polyphenol content of the oil is not especially mentioned in the Chen and Decio reference, Lai Ganguli teaches that it is a known component of olive oil. Lai Ganguli also teaches that levels of polyphenols that are less than 240 ppm are hardly bitter (compare Table 1 with Table III of Lai Ganguli) and would not be expected to have a bitter taste.

Applicant argues that Decio does not provide any incentive to utilize an olive oil that contains polyphenols and does not provide any incentive to use an olive oil that has an olive oil odor in it. Applicant also argues that there is no teaching in Lai Ganguli to the use of the olive oil in a spread. This has been considered but is not persuasive. To use the olive oil of Lai Ganguli in the spread of Decio would have been an obvious substitution of one equivalent olive oil for another. To select an olive oil with less olive oil odor would have been an obvious way of preparing a spread product that tastes more like butter rather than olive oil. To select an olive oil with the level of polyphenols of Lai Ganguli would have been an obvious way to

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711

Art Unit: 1761

enhance the oxidative stability of the oil and to provide added health benefits (note page 2, lines 20-27).

Applicant argues a temperature range of the oil treatment but the claims are directed to a product and not to a process so no weight is attached to this feature. Applicants' arguments relating to the combination of the references have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant appears to be optimizing the oil of Decio to suit his specific requirements. No claim is allowed.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decio in view of Chen and further in view of Lai Ganguli as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Baileys at page 67.

The claims appear to differ from Decio in view of Chen and further in view of Lai Ganguli in the recitation of the presence of squalene in the oil. Baileys teaches at page 67 that squalene is a natural constituent of olive oil and provides a range of the amount of squalene that is within the range of the claims. Thus one would expect that the spread of Decio that contains olive oil to inherently also contain squalene. Further one would not expect the squalene content of olive oil to be reduced by the treatment process of

Art Unit: 1761

Lai Ganguli because squalene is a hydrocarbon, soluble in oil, which would not be expected to be extracted by the water of Lai Ganguli.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711 Page 6

Art Unit: 1761

number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks, can be reached on (571) 272-1401 or by dialing 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAROLYN PADEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER 1761